

EP #2 releasing the sheet of glass from the first and second shaping surface areas of the suction mold onto a quenching ring and moving the sheet of glass to quenching.

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 5-8 have been amended. Claim 10 has been added. Claims 5-8 and 10 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, by indicating the specification as originally filed did not provide support for some of the amendments made in the last response. On consideration of the Examiner's remarks, claims 1 and 4 have been canceled. Claim 10 has been added in replacement thereof and in view of the Examiner's comments. The word "gradually" has been deleted from claim 6. Claim 9 has been canceled. It is submitted that the objection to the specification is no longer appropriate.

The Examiner rejected the claims in view of the objection to the specification. Similarly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 4 has been canceled. The Examiner's comments have been considered with respect to claim 10 and the amendments to claims 5, 7, and 8. It is submitted that the rejection is no longer appropriate.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious on consideration of Seymour in view of McMaster.

Seymour discloses in Figures 13-28 and accompanying discussion glass forming mechanism which includes lifting of a sheet of glass using a vacuum such that a portion of the glass may be shaped by a shaping block which also may include vacuum. The sheet of glass thereafter, however, is dropped onto a shaping mold such that the impact of the fall causes the glass sheet to bend to the curvature defined by the shaping mold.

McMaster teaches forming of glass sheets by engaging them with molds both beneath and above the glass sheet.

The method of claim 10 requires the steps of placing a sheet of glass on a ring mold, bringing a suction mold and the ring mold toward one another. Developing a first vacuum in a first suction chamber at a first time to attract and bend the sheet of glass against the first shaping surface area and then

developing a second vacuum in the second suction chamber at a second time to attract and bend the sheet of glass against the second shaping surface area.

Seymour uses a vacuum to lift a sheet of glass and in combination with a shaping block to give the sheet of glass some initial shaping. Seymour's actual bending step, however, occurs when the sheet of glass is dropped onto a shaping mold. The method of claim 10, on the other hand, achieves complete shaping of the sheet of glass by attracting the sheet of glass with a vacuum against the shaping surface areas; that is, first, against a first shaping surface area and then second, against a second surface area. With the method of claim 10, there is no dropping of the sheet of glass to finalize bending. Rather, the sheet of glass is released onto a quenching ring for movement to the final quenching stage. Seymour does not teach complete bending of the sheet of glass by a suction mold having multiple shaping surface areas which draw vacuums at different times so as to shape successively. Furthermore, the method of claim 10 then moves the sheet of glass to quenching and does not require the step, as taught by Seymour, of releasing the vacuum so that the sheet of glass can fall onto a shaping mold. McMaster adds nothing further with respect to the method of claim 10. The method of

add 4. bend
steps
and OK

claim 10 and the references cause bending by different steps. Claim 10 makes clear the difference. Consequently, the method of claim 10 does not follow from the cited references and is patentable thereover.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious on consideration of Seymour in view of Kuster '225. Claims 1-4 have been canceled and rewritten in terms of claim 10.

Seymour was discussed above. Kuster '225 teaches the use of an annular frame to press a sheet of glass against a solid surface curving form and then using hot gas to force the sheet of glass against the form.

The claims have been adequately distinguished with respect to Seymour. The patent of Kuster '225 has no particularly relevant teaching with respect to claim 10. Hence, claim 10 is also nonobvious with respect to this combination of the references.

Claims 5-9 and 11 further define the novel aspects of the method of claim 10. They should also be patentable. In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested. Allowance of claims 5-11 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsya Mizusugi, et al.

By their attorneys,

MERCHANT, GOULD, SMITH, EDELL,
WELTER, & SCHMIDT, P.A.
3100 Norwest Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-5300

Dated: August ³⁰~~28~~, 1996

By Curtis B. Hamre
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165